

---

---

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD  
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

---

---

Landmark/District:	<b>Cleveland Park Historic District</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda
Address:	<b>3512 Rodman Street NW</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consent
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concept
Meeting Date:	<b>May 26, 2016</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alteration
Case Number:	<b>16-345</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	<b>Frances McMillen</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition
		<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision

---

---

Applicants Nic Higgins and Bridget Brink, with drawings prepared by Hamilton Snowber Architects, request concept review for a two-story rear addition, basement expansion, rear storage shed, and front porch to 3512 Rodman Street NW in the Cleveland Park Historic District.

**Property Description**

Designed by W.R. Lamar for owner and builder W.D. Sterrett, 3512 Rodman Street NW was constructed in 1926-1927. The brick, two-story Colonial Revival style house has an asphalt shingle side-gable roof. Fenestration consists of single and ganged six-over-six double-hung sash windows on the front elevation. A triangular pediment and fluted pilasters frame the entrance. A single-story shed roof addition is located at the rear of the house.

**Proposal**

The proposal calls for removing the one-story rear addition, basement expansion, a two-story rear addition, storage shed, and front porch. The addition would have an asphalt shingle hipped roof and would be a mix of brick, fiber cement lap siding, and wood panels. Fenestration would consist of six-over-one double-hung windows. A breakfast room with a hipped roof and a trellis would project off the rear of the addition. The proposed front porch would project approximately 6' from the house and would cover a new masonry stoop. A wood pediment topped by a shingle roof would be supported by painted wood columns. Painted wood panels would flank the entry. The proposed 20x7 storage shed would be located in the rear yard along the western property line.

**Evaluation**

The Board has been reluctant to approve proposals for additive, historicist architectural features, which are supplemental to the architect's original design intent. Such proposals are certainly inappropriate when they are not, in fact, historically appropriate or accurate for the style and era of construction. However, the Board has also taken a somewhat more nuanced approach in cases where an argument can be made that the additive feature is itself compatible with the character of the affected property and is closely based on relevant historical precedent.

In this instance, side gabled Colonial Revival houses, which dominated residential architecture of the 1920s through the 1940s, commonly featured entry porches. The most frequent details for these porches include gable or barrel-shaped roofs, single or paired square columns with articulated capitals, arched openings that followed the arch of the fanlight, projecting cornices, and cornice returns.

While the Board's guidelines *Porches and Steps on Historic Buildings* indicate that adding front porches can be an inappropriate change, a number of applications for porch additions in Cleveland Park have been found to be compatible on a case-by-case basis. The Board approved front porches similar to the current proposal at 3508 and 3403 Rodman Street; 3010 Ordway, where a new front porch replaced an existing non-historic porch; 3205 33<sup>rd</sup> Place, a non-contributing building from the 1950s; and at 3520 Rodman, 3342 Rowland, and 3215 Rowland, where appropriately scaled and designed entry porches were added. Alternately, the Board determined that front porches at 3065 Porter, 3511 Idaho and 2938 Macomb were not compatible with the architectural character of those houses. The latter, a Dutch Colonial Revival house on Macomb, would have removed the original bracketed stoop cover, which was a significant element of the architectural character, and added a feature to a house type that was never intended to have a full width front porch.

In this case, because of the presence of small entry porches on houses from this period and in this architectural style, the HPO finds that adding a porch is a compatible alteration. The applicant is encouraged to continue working with staff on finalizing the design for the entrance, in particular the details for the panels flanking the door.

The rear addition is compatible with the house and the historic district in terms of overall massing, scale, design, height, fenestration, and materials. The addition is smaller than the original house, establishing a subordinate relationship between new and old. The choice of materials and fenestration differentiates the addition from the house. The applicant is encouraged to work with staff on the selection of a brick that is distinguished from the original building so it is clear it is of a later construction.

The proposed storage shed is an unusual size for a secondary structure, but it is located towards the rear of the property and will only be minimally visible from the street.

### **Recommendation**

*The HPO recommends that the Board find the proposal compatible with the historic district and delegate final approval to staff with the condition the applicant continue to work with staff on the selection of materials and finalizing the design.*